

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RICHARD WEDDLE,	)	3:14-cv-00241-MMD-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	January 25, 2016
	)	
RENEE BAKER, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Copywork Limit (ECF No. 73). Plaintiff seeks a twenty dollar extension "to copy exhibits and to further litigate this case to the 9th Circuit." (*Id.* at 1.)

Because no final judgment has been entered in this case, it would be premature for Plaintiff to commence litigation of this action with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Therefore, that basis for a copywork extension is not well grounded.

Plaintiff's further rationale is that he needs to "copy exhibits." Plaintiff does not suggest what exhibits he may have to copy or for what purpose the copies might be utilized. The docket in this matter reflects that Plaintiff has already filed an Objection to this court's Report and Recommendation of December 2, 2015 (ECF No. 66) to which Objection Plaintiff appended three exhibits (ECF No. 71). Plaintiff has recently filed a motion (ECF No. 73) to extend time to file an objection to a subsequent Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 70, 1/11/16) but does not state whether he will need to submit additional exhibits beyond those 13 pages of documents which accompanied his Response (ECF No. 62) to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 57).

The court notes Plaintiff is housed at Lovelock Correctional Center which participates in the court's Electronic Filing program, which obviates the need for duplication of filings (Plaintiff's Motion No. 73 reflects it was served via email through the law library staff (*id.* at 9)).

